

## II. REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed on October 18, 2006, the Examiner: (1) rejected claims 1, 5-17, 21-33, and 37-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,728,265 to Yavatkar et al. (hereinafter "Yavatkar") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,052,375 to Bass et al. (hereinafter "Bass"); and (2) objected to claims 2-4, 18-20, and 34-36 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that these claims "would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims" because "the prior art [alone] or in combination fails to teach or make obvious the limitations" recited in the objected to claims. (Office Action, page 3, 8-9) Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating the allowable subject matter.

### A. Response to Examiner's Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 5-17, 21-33, and 37-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yavatkar in view of Bass. (Office Action, page 3) Applicants have cancelled all the previously pending claims and submitted new claims, thereby rendering moot the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as set forth in the October 18, 2006 Office Action.

## III. CONCLUSION

Applicants request reconsideration of the present application and submit that the newly presented claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner feel that further dialog would advance the subject application to issuance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (312) 913-3305.

Respectfully submitted,  
McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP

Date: April 18, 2007

By: /Robert J. Irvine III/  
Robert J. Irvine  
Registration No. 41,865